

REMARKS

The claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of U.K. 2,009,362 (newly cited, of record) and Burnham '401.

The admitted prior art teaches forming a hose by steps a) to d) in the claim. The hose is a multi-layered, internally reinforced hose that has an outermost exposed helical reinforcement of PVC, nylon, or other plastic-like polymer rod.

If this is what is taught by the primary reference and known by the person of skill in the art at the time of the invention (and it certainly was as the admitted prior art is Applicant own manufacturing process for making drop hose), the relevant question is: what would one skilled in the art have found obvious to do, in light of the cited secondary references, to solve the problem of forming soft cuffs in the admitted prior art hose.

UK is cited for teaching it is known to remove a helical reinforcing layer that is relatively external to an internal layer. The removal method is performed during a post manufacturing operation to form a hose end having a soft cuff (i.e., no restricting helical reinforcement in the hose end). The purpose of UK is to make it easier for the end user to select a hose having the desired length; and the method taught may be used by either the hose manufacturer in the plant or by the end user in the field.

In the advisory action, it is held that it would have been "understood to have been simpler to avoid the cutting operation" of UK by using the manufacturing method of Burnham at the manufacturing plant. However, there is nothing in either reference that teaches that the method of Burnham is "simpler" over a different method. This is pure speculation not supported by evidence in the prior art. And, if the explicit reinforcement removal teachings of UK are to be completely discounted in the rejection for an alleged "simpler" method – than why bother to include UK in the rejection in the first place? All that UK adds over Burnham is a teaching of a reinforcing layer internal to the helical reinforcing layer being removed– and such an internal reinforcing layer is already a known component in the admitted prior art hose.


In the first advisory action, it is made clear that the asserted external reinforcement of UK '362 is simply external to the internal reinforcement layer 2 of UK '362; the external reinforcement layer of UK '362 is not an external reinforcement as presently claimed.

Both Burnham '401 and UK '362 are directed to hoses that have internal helical reinforcements, and both references teach methods of forming hoses wherein a length portion of the hose has no such internal helical reinforcement. The admitted prior art is directed to forming a hose with an external helical reinforcement. One skilled in the art looking to modify the teachings of the admitted prior art in order to eliminate external helical reinforcements in the continuous manufacturing method of the admitted prior art is highly unlikely to look to internal reinforcement teachings, and there is no motivation in the Burnham or UK 362 to use such teachings in the manufacture of an externally reinforced hose of the type of the admitted prior art.

As the admitted prior art in view of U.K. '362 and Burnham '401 fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the invention as recited in claims 4-8, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In light of this amendment, all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application are allowable. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to allow all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Nancy T. Krawczyk - Reg. No. 38,744
Attorney for Applicants

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company
Department 823
1144 East Market Street
Akron, Ohio 44316-0001
Telephone: (330) 796-5240
Facsimile: (330) 796-9018